

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed June 6, 2008, the Examiner noted that claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-17 and 19-24 were pending, and rejected all claims. Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 13, 19-21, 23 and 24 have been amended and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-17 and 19-24 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejection is traversed below.

Page 4 of the Office Action the Examiner rejects all claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Buxton and DecoTech.

As discussed with the Examiner in the Interview, the invention of claim 1 is directed to a situation where an interface that appears on a display has two parts. A first part that moves with the viewpoint of the display and a second part that does not. That is, when the display is at point A it displays both parts. When the display is moved to a second point B, the first part moves with the display viewpoint and is still visible in the display, but the second part does not and is left behind at the first point A and, thus, is not visible when the display is at viewpoint B. That is, the two interface parts are now located, respectively "at" the two points A and B. In a hypothetical example, the first part of the interface might be associated with the entirety of an object in the scene, such as an interface part that allows a user to change the color of an entire car. The second interface part might be associated with only a part of the car, such as allowing a user to change a front grill from a vertical bar grill to a horizontal bar grill. When the display is at the viewpoint (A) where the grill can be seen, both interface parts (grill and entire car) are visible in the display. When the viewpoint of the display is moved to a different location, such as looking at the rear of the car (B), the grill interface part has been left behind at point A and now at the new viewpoint (B), only the entire car interface part is visible. This is emphasized in claim 1 by "the first graphical user interface part is automatically reoriented relative to the display in accordance with a change to viewpoint orientation/location information of the display; and allowing the second graphical user interface part to remain in a same orientation relative to the display regardless of the change to the viewpoint orientation/location information of the display". As was recognized by the Examiner during the Interview, this feature has not been found in Buxton and/or DecoTech.

Claims 8, 9, 11, 13, 19-21, 23 and 24 also emphasize a similar feature.

It is submitted that the independent claims distinguish over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite

additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 15 calls for multiple interface parts that can be fixed in place or oriented relative to each other. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 6, 2008

By: /J. Randall Beckers/  
J. Randall Beckers  
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501